UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

PRENTISS C	ARADINE, II,)	
	Petitioner,)	
v.)	No. 4:24-cv-01229-HEA
KITO BESS,)	
	Respondent.)	

OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon its own motion. As explained in the Court's November 27, 2024 order, Petitioner filed the instant Petition after the expiration of the applicable statute of limitations. The Court directed Petitioner to show cause why his Petition should not be dismissed as untimely, and cautioned him that this case could be dismissed if he failed to timely respond. Petitioner's response was due on December 27, 2024, but to date, he has not responded to the Court's order or requested additional time to do so.

After careful consideration, the Court concludes that the Petition is time-barred and Petitioner has failed to show cause why it should not be dismissed as such. The Court will therefore dismiss the Petition at this time pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. *See Day v. McDonough*, 547 U.S. 198, 209 (2006) (a district court can dismiss an untimely § 2254 petition on its own motion after giving notice to the petitioner).

This Court is not required to issue a certificate of appealability unless Petitioner demonstrates that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the application states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right; and (2) whether the court was correct in its

procedural ruling. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Petitioner has made no such showing here, so the Court will not issue a certificate of appealability.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice. A separate order of dismissal will be entered herewith.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court will not issue a certificate of appealability. Dated this 31st day of December, 2024.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE